



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/036,980      | 12/31/2001  | Eric R. White        | VIGN1370-1          | 5326             |

25094 7590 07/19/2005

DLA PIPER RUDNICK GRAY CARY US, LLP  
2000 University Avenue  
E. Palo Alto, CA 94303-2248

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

WU, QING YUAN

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2194

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/036,980

Applicant(s)

WHITE ET AL.

Examiner

Qing-Yuan Wu

Art Unit

2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/9/05.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 May 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-26 are pending in the application.

#### *Claim Objections*

2. Claim 25 is objected to because of the following informalities: A claim cannot depend on itself. Appropriate correction is required.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 1-8 and 17-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The following claim language is indefinite:

- i. As per claims 1 and 17, it is uncertain whether “a public API” or workflow engines” that comprises “a set of generic objects” (i.e. does applicant mean “a public API comprising a set of generic objects for the heterogeneous workflow engines” as recited in claim 9 lines 11-12?).

- ii. As per claim 17, it is uncertain what the relationship is between the public API and the workflow engine API (i.e. is the set of native objects for each workflow engine within the workflow engine API?)

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-2, 5-7, 9-10, 13-15, 17-20, and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaung (U.S. PG Pub 20030023662 A1), in view of Schechter et al (hereafter Schechter) (U.S. PG Pub 20020133635 A1).

7. Yaung was cited in the last office action.

8. As to claim 17, Yaung teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method for integrating workflow engines comprising:

interfacing with an workflow engine through an associated workflow engine API [564, 560, 580, 582, Fig. 7; pg. 8, paragraph 128];

9. Yaung does not specifically teach a public API, at least two heterogeneous underlying workflow engines, and a set of generic objects or mapping said set of generic objects to a set of native objects for each of said underlying workflow engines. However, Yaung disclosed translating methods from server side object to native code used by workflow engine [pg. 8,

paragraph 128]. In addition, Schechter teaches Device Interaction Component, heterogeneous devices/device capabilities, server application objects not constructed for use on only one device, and adapters for transforming server objects to a format or form suitable for the device [Schechter, Fig. 4; paragraph 35, lines 6-10; paragraphs 36-40; abstract; 220A-C, Fig. 2].

10. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have combined the teaching of Yaung and the teaching of Schechter because the teaching of Schechter optimized the teaching of Yaung by not having to develop a new or different application/sub-application for heterogeneous devices/workflow engine APIs.

11. As to claim 18, Yaung as modified teaches the invention substantially as claimed including:

persistently maintaining a generic object [558, 578, Fig. 7; Schechter, paragraph 36]. (Examiner's interpretation of "persistently maintaining," as any action/non-action that ensure the continue existence of the object since the applicant did not preclude nor define this limitation).

Yaung as modified does not specifically teach a generic process definition object or native process definition object. However, Yaung disclosed methods invoked on the workflow server from the workflow service object are translated by a program interface to native code used by workflow engine [pg. 8, paragraph 128, lines 2-4]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have recognized that the method calls could be calls used to invoke process definition objects in the workflow engine.

In addition, Yaung as modified does not specifically teach, delegating at least a portion of the set of generic objects to a set of corresponding native objects. However, Schechter disclosed transforming a server object and displayed on a device [Schechter, paragraph 38]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to delegate at least a portion of the set of generic objects to a set of corresponding native objects to allow communication between the interfaces.

12. As to claim 19, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 17 above.

13. As to claim 20, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 17 above. In addition, Yaung as modified teaches mapping said native result to a generic result usable by a generic object from said set of generic objects [Schechter, pg. 3, paragraph 29, lines 5-7].

14. As to claim 23, Yaung as modified does not specifically teaches wherein in said set of generic objects is based upon an industry standard for workflow management. However, Yaung disclosed service class implementations that provide methods and objects from the same abstract service class [pg. 1, paragraph 13, lines 5-7]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have recognized that the generic object have to be based upon an industry standard (i.e. standards promulgated by the Workflow Management Coalition are well know in the art) for workflow management in order to allow the public API or workflow/data store API to overcome the restriction due to the different vendor

Art Unit: 2194

implementations (i.e. to allow maximum compatibility between generic objects and proprietary objects).

15. As to claims 24-25 these claims are rejected for the same reason as claim 23 above.

16. As to claim 1, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 17 above. In addition, Young as modified teaches a plurality of adapters [Schechter, pg. 4, paragraphs 37-40; Fig. 4].

17. As to claim 2, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1, 17-19 above.

18. As to claims 5-7, these are system claims that correspond to method claims 23-25 above. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reason as claims 23-25 above.

19. As to claim 9, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claims 1 and 17 above. In addition, Young as modified teaches a first workflow engine [560, Fig. 7], a second workflow engine [582, Fig. 7];

20. As to claim 10, this claim is rejected for the same reason as claim 2 above.

21. As to claims 13-15, these are system claims that correspond to method claims 23-25. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reason as claims 23-25 above.

Art Unit: 2194

22. Claims 3-4, 8, 11-12, 16, 21-22, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yaung and Schechter as applied to claims 1, 9 and 23 above, further in view of Parnell et al (hereafter Parnell) (U.S. Patent 6,647,396).

23. Parnell was cited in the last office action.

24. As to claims 21-22, Yaung as modified does not specifically teach wherein said set of generic objects further comprises a payload object, and wherein said payload object associates a set of content items with a process instance. However, Parnell teaches applying content management to workflows [Parnell, col. 3, lines 5-12]. It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to have combine the teaching of Parnell with the teaching of Yaung and Schechter to include a payload object that associate a set of content items with a process instance given that the content might have been access previously or will be access multiple times.

25. As to claim 26, this claim is rejected for the same as claims 21-22 above.

26. As to claims 3-4, these are system claims that correspond to method claims 21-22. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reason as claims 21-22 above.

27. As to claim 8, this is a system claim that corresponds to method claim 26. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 26 above.



28. As to claims 11-12, these are system claims that correspond to method claims 21-22.

Therefore, they are rejected for the same reason as claims 21-22 above.

29. As to claim 16, this is a system claim that corresponds to method claim 26. Therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 26 above.

*Response to Arguments*

30. Applicant's arguments filed 5/9/05 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

31. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2194

32. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Qing-Yuan Wu whose telephone number is (571) 272-3776. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Qing-Yuan Wu

Examiner

Art Unit 2194

  
MENG-AL T. AN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100